

Citizens Advisory Committee on Pipeline Safety  
Meeting Minutes Summary  
Location: WUTC - Olympia, WA  
**February 18, 2003**

**Present**

Chuck Mosher, Chair  
Shirley Olson  
Les Olson  
Pat Bahor  
George Hills  
Richard Kuprewicz  
Ken Thomas

**Absent**

Don Evans  
Grant Jensen  
Duane Henderson  
Haywood Johnson

**Agenda:**

1. Welcome & adoption of January 21, 2003 Meeting Minutes
2. Debrief and Discussion of OPS Public Awareness Forum
3. Discussion of Federal Integrity Management Natural Gas Rulemaking
4. Subcommittee Reports
5. Pipeline Safety Trust Proposal
6. WUTC Pipeline Safety Section Update
7. Public Comment and Items for the Next Agenda

**NOTE: There was no public comment during the February 18, 2003 meeting.**

1. **Welcome** – Chairman Chuck Mosher welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Citizens Committee on Pipeline Safety. Chairman Mosher asked the Committee for revisions to the January 21, 2003 meeting minutes. Committee member Richard Kuprewicz asked that a clarification within the minutes about what type of pipeline the WUTC gas rulemaking is discussing. He suggested that some language be added that states the rulemaking is for intrastate distribution natural gas lines and not transmission natural gas lines.  
Chairman Mosher let the Committee know that a video library has been started for the use of the Committee and citizens. The videos include the Olympic Pipeline Bellingham accident and some Dig Safely videos. Committee members or citizens may contact Lindsay Walker with the WUTC if they are interested in borrowing a video.

2. **Debrief and Discussion of OPS Public Awareness Forum** – Chairman Mosher began the discussion about the Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) Public Awareness Forum that was held on Wednesday January 29, 2003 in Bellevue, Washington. The Chair expressed that the meeting was a very good opportunity and he was delighted that OPS held one of their regional meetings in Washington State. He stated that he was concerned that there was not a lot of public attendance at the pipeline public awareness forum. Committee member Les Olson asked Steve Rieger, OPS Engineer who was in attendance at the February 18<sup>th</sup> Committee meeting, what the feedback was from OPS on the outcome of the meeting. Steve noted that OPS was also concerned with the lack of public involvement at the meeting. He was curious if the message got out to citizens or if the issue of pipelines is losing its “pizzazz”.
- Committee member Shirley Olson commented by saying that she felt that the timing, and the location of the meeting was a problem. She said that the meeting would have been better attended if it were held on a Saturday. She believed that people were not able to get off work by five and then fight Seattle traffic to attend a meeting that adjourned at 7:00pm. Dealing with traffic was very difficult with the meeting held in Bellevue. She would of also liked to have seen the meeting focus on a more national level. Ms. Olson said that she reads the paper everyday and didn’t see an announcement of the meeting. She feels that it would have been also been better attended if the papers would of printed an article or announcement of the meeting.
- Carole Washburn, with the WUTC, pointed out that she worked with Stacey Gerard, Associate Administrator of OPS, on putting together a focus group initially to look at all the issues that Ms. Olson raised like the timing of the meeting, the location and the announcement of it. The discussion with OPS involved key players in pipeline safety issues and also included people from Bellingham, Washington. Carole noted that the group suggested the Saturday meeting, but the suggestion was not taken by OPS. She stated that the Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) handled the public relations and media announcements and the WUTC offered their help with the process. The WUTC wanted to remain respectful to their process for announcing the meetings. The WUTC had to wait for the press release for the meeting from RSPA and received it too late to try to get it into publication in most newspapers. The Bellingham and Bellevue area newspapers covered the meeting announcement quite well, but the general public did not hear of the meeting unless they were already involved in the pipeline safety issues. Committee member Pat Babor suggested that the announcements of the meetings could be done over the radio in order to increase turn out of the public.
- Chairman Mosher reminded the Committee that they had talked about doing a pipeline safety day to raise awareness of the issues surrounding pipelines. He felt that these ideas were good ways to keep the importance of pipeline safety in the public spotlight. The Committee felt that it’s better to inform people about pipelines before a major incident occurs. Ms. Olson also noted that citizens don’t appreciate using fear tactics to scare people into learning about pipelines. Dave Robertson, with PG&E Gas Transmission - Northwest, stated that he and his company would be willing to work with the Committee to hold pipeline safety fairs or meetings across the state on the pipeline safety day or week. He felt it was a good idea to conduct the education outreach throughout the region.

Steve King, with the WUTC noted that the Frause Group and Round Table Associates were in attendance at the OPS meeting in January to help study the key question “How do we keep citizens involved and interested in pipeline safety?”

The Committee members that attended the meeting were encouraged that the panel discussions were very well represented by key stakeholders and the meeting got the discussion going in the community. The Committee decided to draft a letter to OPS thanking them for the opportunity to have a meeting like this in the Seattle area and encouraging them to continue holding these public outreach meetings. They would also like to suggest in the letter how to gain more public participation at the meetings that will be held in other states this spring. The Committee wanted to know if they would be involved in the other OPS meetings that will be held in Texas and New Jersey?


Chairman Mosher said that the Committee would probably not be needed to attend those meetings, but pointed out that it’s very possible a Committee member could be asked to participate on one of these panels. Committee member Les Olson suggested that the WUTC should contact Texas and New Jersey and communicate with them the suggestions on how the meetings may be conducted and publicized.

The Committee will also be drafting a letter to key Washington Congressional legislators on what occurred at the OPS meeting and how important it was to the State of Washington. The letter would also thank the Legislators like Inslee, Dunn, Larsen and Murray for their attention to the issues of pipeline safety.

3. **Discussion of Federal Integrity Management Natural Gas Rulemaking** - WUTC staff distributed a summary of the rulemaking from pipeline integrity management in high consequence areas for gas transmission pipelines (docket no. RSPA-00-7666; Notice 4). The federal register notice of proposed rulemaking document is 60 pages long and is available at <http://dms.dot.gov/search>. Steve King said that staff would be better prepared to present more information on the rulemaking at the March meeting after the Committee and staff has had time to read and analyze the rulemaking. He noted that the notice of proposed rulemaking is very complicated because it relies heavily on technical provisions and recommendations in ASME/ANSI B31.8S. Anyone who is not a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) must purchase these standards at a substantial cost. This is one area the Committee felt strongly about and decided that they would like to submit comments requesting that OPS make the standards available to potential commenters. The Committee noticed that the deadline for making comments on the rulemaking is March 31, 2003. They suggested that, given that the rulemaking appears to be very technical and was not published until January 28, 2003, more time should be allowed to read and understand the draft language. In summary, the Committee decided to submit comments to the rulemaking right away on the issue of the March 31<sup>st</sup> deadline and the references to the ASME/ANSI standards and their availability.

Committee member Rick Kuprewicz brought up the point that the definition for high consequence areas (for gas transmission) has been changed since August 2002. The current definition would only included an estimated five percent of pipelines in the nation’s systems, whereas before the definition was changed there was a perception by many that about 85 percent of the pipelines systems might be covered. In reality, the percentage of pipeline miles covered is not as important as the actual “at risk” miles that

eventually get addressed by IM rulemaking. The reality is that a small percentage of gas transmission mileage will fall under final HCA definition and IM rulemaking. Mr. Kuprewicz feels that things are backwards and it relates to the new definition of HCAs. In his opinion, we are adding more pipelines for inspection that have the highest safety margin (class 3 or 4 areas), but are shedding more lines that have the least safety margin (class 1 or 2)..

The general consensus from the Committee was that the rule and definitions of HCAs is very technical and confusing and they are concerned that if it is adopted this way the public and the industry may have trouble interpreting the rule and understanding it. The Committee planned to incorporate this point in their comments that they will submit by March 31<sup>st</sup>. Chairman Mosher asked Mr. Kuprewicz to highlight the areas of concern within the rulemaking. The Chairman also asked WUTC staff for a summary of the political areas that the Committee could comment on, like the clarification of the term “public official”. He felt that the Committee would be more beneficial to the rulemaking if they comm~~ent~~d on the citizen policy issues in the rulemaking as opposed to the more technical issues.

4. **Subcommittee Reports** – During this time, the Committee split up into their subcommittees and discussed their workplan items for the upcoming year. The following information is what was reported back from the subcommittees:

**Governmental Input and Monitoring subcommittee –**

- Comment on relevant state and federal rulemakings.
- Review and understand the state pipeline inspection process. Understanding this process will help in drafting the Committee annual report.
- Draft a “one-pager” on the positions of the Committee appropriate for both the state and national levels. Document will help to clarify the key issues the Committee as a whole intends to focus on.
- Possibly work with pipeline companies on the right-to-know issue regarding pipeline information. The Governmental Input and Monitoring subcommittee felt that this issue is a balancing act between providing too much information that could be detrimental in providing enough information to concerned citizens.

**Public Awareness subcommittee –**

Announced Pat Bahor as the new chair of the Public Awareness subcommittee. The subcommittee felt that they had a lot of questions that needed to be answered regarding their workplan item and plan to meet and e-mail between regular Committee meetings.

- Pipeline safety day or week proclaimed by the Governor.  
Key points:  
Focus will be pipeline safety  
Don’t make it too technical  
Don’t use fear tactics
- Need to research further:  
Funding?

How many meetings/events will be held and where throughout the state?  
(Possibly tap into Committee member Les Olson's connections to the regional emergency areas).

Organize a "show and tell" of the pipeline industries.

Who can help outside the Committee?

Who will lead the organizing? The Subcommittee or the Committee?

The Public Awareness subcommittee will be meeting with the Frause Group and Round Table Associates to make sure they are working on the "same page". The subcommittee plans to present the scope of the project at the next meeting in March. The subcommittee said that they could e-mail the plan to the Committee before the next meeting for their review. Chairman Mosher said that he liked the idea of a pipeline safety week in order to hold events across the state.

**Damage Prevention subcommittee** – No report was made due to lack of subcommittee members.

5. **Pipeline Safety Trust Proposal** – Carl Weimer, with SAFE Bellingham, came to the Committee to speak to them about the concept of the pipeline safety trust proposal that is being created by the families of the children that were involved in the Olympic Pipeline accident in Bellingham. The parents of the children have been very involved in this trust proposal and want the trust to help educate citizens about pipelines. Currently \$20 million dollars is being levied against Olympic Pipeline Company (and its parent companies) that has been designated for local projects. The DOE and the U.S. Attorney plans to spend that money locally in Washington State. Basically the trust proposes to use some of the fine money to set up an on-going national pipeline safety trust that would be a collaborative approach, similar to the Citizens Committee on Pipeline Safety, to bring an awareness of pipeline safety education and issues to citizens that need or want pipeline information. The trust would set up an independent group that would have paid administrative staff to help the board. The board and the trust will be loosely modeled after the Alaska's Regional Citizens Advisory Committee (RCAC), which was established after the Exxon Valdez spill.

**Proposed projects the trust would fund:**

- Education to communities.
- Work with government agencies, committees and groups that focus on pipeline safety.
- Hiring consultants to do independent studies.
- Hire engineers or specialist to review federal rulemakings and comment from a citizen standpoint.
- Experts on staff that could answer pipeline related questions of concerned citizens around the U.S.
- Create a user friendly website that has pipeline information on it that would be gathered from a variety of sources. The website would include information about pipeline companies, like contact information, safety records, spill records, safety data, and integrity management plans.
- Would like to be seen as an independent party that works with government agencies and the pipeline companies.

- Upgrading first responder communication equipment by purchasing radios, etc.
- On-going restoration of Whatcom Creek.
- Travel funds to send a person from the trust board/staff to a community that has had a pipeline incident in order to offer advice.

The funds will be distributed and collected sometime in April 2003 when the criminal lawsuit against Olympic and Equillon will be holding the final court date.

Committee member Rick Kuprewicz does not foresee a conflict with the Committee and the trust. The trust would be able to hire experts that would look at things on a more technical level while the Committee tries to look at things on public level.

Carole Washburn, Executive Director of the WUTC, also supports the pipeline trust. She said that the reality is that the State of Washington City-County Consortium will likely continue for a couple more years then they have to ask themselves “What is our purpose here”. Fortunately with the money that Senator Murray and Gordon provided our state the WUTC was able to help the Consortium to continue their efforts. But the reality is that it isn’t going to last. The other reality is, as Ms. Washburn pointed out, is that the WUTC is not funded to properly staff the Citizens Committee. These groups are not sustainable. She strongly feels the need for this kind of a national level group to help all citizens stay involved and to continue do the good work that the people of the State of Washington have been able to do the last few years. Ms. Washburn felt that the trust proposal brings a lot of hope for the future.

The Committee moved to write a letter in support of the Pipeline Safety Trust Proposal. They plan to mention in the letter that the Committee has been looking into the pipeline safety issues for a couple of years and see the need for more public involvement in which this trust would provide.

6. **WUTC Pipeline Safety Section Update** – Kim West, WUTC Senior Pipeline Safety Engineer, summarized the inspections that were conducted in 2002 by the WUTC pipeline safety section. She explained the difference between a standard and a specialized inspections. A standard inspection is a review of the pipeline companies operations & maintenance, emergency response, repair and replacement procedures. The WUTC inspector contacts the pipeline operator and sets up an appointment for the inspector to come to the pipeline facility. A specialized inspection can be a response to a pipeline incident, new construction, investigations, complaints and/or public inquiries. These can often be spontaneous, unscheduled inspections of a pipeline company, as compared to the scheduled standard inspections. Also considered specialized inspections are the waivers to state rules and certificates of public convenience and necessity where the engineers ensure that there are no safety concerns. Ms. West summarized what was found during the 2002 inspections. She noted that intrastate distribution inspections had most of the concerns and non-compliances in comparison to the other types of pipelines. Ms. West said that the items were mostly improper documentation of tests and other company procedural items. She said on the

hazardous liquid side the non-compliances were mostly the companies not reviewing their welding procedures.

An overall trend that Ms. West and the other WUTC inspectors noticed in the field was the pipeline companies' limited training due to the pipeline companies' budgets. She said that field personnel often work several jobs, instead of having an expert for each area.

Ms. West noted that the training and experience of the workers would be brought up during the operator qualification inspections that will be conducted in 2003.

Ms. West spoke to the Committee about integrity management inspections, which is another type of inspection that will be conducted in 2003. The hazardous liquid integrity management inspections will be a team effort by the WUTC and OPS.

Next, Ms. West explained the process that the WUTC engineers follow after the field inspection is completed. The engineer writes up a non-compliance report of the findings that were noted during the inspection. The WUTC sends this out to the company and asks them to respond to the findings within 30 days. The interstate inspection reports are submitted to OPS for further action. The role of the inspection is not to be punitive, but to be supportive. The WUTC and the operators work together to correct the non-compliances. Often an interpretation of the rule can be an issue.

If the WUTC finds repeat violations from a previous inspection, penalties can be recommended to the Commission. Intrastate penalty funds go into a pipeline safety fund, while interstate penalties funds go into a federal general fund.

Steve King, with the WUTC, reminded the Committee of the state natural gas rulemaking workshop (UG-011073) that will be held on Tuesday February 25, 2003 at the Commission. The workshop allows for the WUTC staff and the pipeline companies to discuss the rules, as they are being re-drafted.

Steve also updated the Committee on the GIS consultant project that the WUTC is working on with GeoNorth. Steve noted how the WUTC is currently reviewing the draft implementation plan report that GeoNorth has written. The next step in the GIS project is to evaluate which recommended projects would be put out to bid and which projects the WUTC will handle.

7. **Public comment and items for next agenda** – There was no public comment during the afternoon. The Committee expressed an interest in continuing the discussion of the federal gas integrity management rulemaking. The WUTC also let the Committee know that an inspection presentation from a WUTC pipeline safety engineer would be presented at the March meeting.